

THE CAMBRIDGE  
HISTORY OF  
Hellenistic Philosophy

\*

*Edited by*

KEIMPE ALGRA

LECTURER IN ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY,  
UNIVERSITY OF UTRECHT

JONATHAN BARNES

PROFESSOR OF ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY,  
UNIVERSITY OF GENEVA

JAAP MANSFELD

PROFESSOR OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL PHILOSOPHY,  
UNIVERSITY OF UTRECHT

MALCOLM SCHOFIELD

PROFESSOR OF ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY,  
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK www.cup.cam.ac.uk  
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA www.cup.org  
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

© Cambridge University Press 1999

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without  
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1999

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

*Typeface* TEFF Renard 9.5/12.75 pt *System* QuarkXPress® [SE]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data*

The Cambridge history of Hellenistic philosophy / edited by Keimpe  
Algra . . . [et al.].  
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 25028 5 (hardback)

1. Philosophy, Ancient. I. Algra, Keimpe, 1959-  
B171.C36 1999 180-dc21 98-36033 CIP

ISBN 0 521 25028 5 hardback

# Contents

*Preface xi*

## PART I INTRODUCTION

### 1 · Sources

*by* JAAP MANSFELD, *Professor of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy,  
University of Utrecht*

I Why so much has been lost	3
II Primary sources	5
III Secondary sources	6
IV <i>Quellenforschung</i>	13
V Genres	16
VI Doxography	17
VII On sects	19
VIII Successions	23
IX Biography	25
X Fragments	26
XI Tradition and reception	29

### 2 · Chronology

*by* TIZIANO DORANDI, *Chercheur at the CNRS, Paris*

I Introduction	31
II The Academy	31
III The Peripatos	35
IV The Stoa	37
V The Garden	43
VI Pyrrhonists	46
VII Minor Socratics	47
VIII Survey	48
<i>Appendix: Successions of scholars</i>	53

### 3 · Organization and structure of the philosophical schools

*by* TIZIANO DORANDI 55

PART II  
LOGIC AND LANGUAGE

## 4 · Introduction

by JONATHAN BARNES, *Professor of Ancient Philosophy, University of Geneva*

I A map of logic	65
II The value of logic	67
III The history of Hellenistic logic	69

## 5 · Logic

by JONATHAN BARNES, SUSANNE BOBZIEN, *Lecturer in Philosophy in the University of Oxford* and MARIO MIGNUCCI, *formerly Professor of Philosophy, University of Padua*

I The Peripatetics	77
II The ‘Megarics’	83
III The Stoics	92

## 6 · Language

by DIRK M. SCHENKEVELD, *Professor Emeritus of Ancient Greek, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam* and JONATHAN BARNES

I Linguistics	177
II Rhetoric	216
III Poetics	221

PART III  
EPISTEMOLOGY

## 7 · Introduction: the beginnings of Hellenistic epistemology

by JACQUES BRUNSCHWIG, *Professor Emeritus of Ancient Philosophy, University of Paris*

I The epistemological turn	229
II Pyrrho	241
III Cyrenaic epistemology	251

## 8 · Epicurean epistemology

by ELIZABETH ASMIS, *Professor, Department of Classics, University of Chicago*

I Canonic	260
II Perceptions	264
III Preconceptions	276
IV Beliefs	283

## 9 · Stoic epistemology

by MICHAEL FREDE, *Professor of the History of Philosophy,  
University of Oxford*

I The possibility of knowledge	295
II Cognition	296
III Cognitive impressions	300
IV Clearness, distinctness, evidence	312
V Assent to cognitive impressions	313
VI The criteria	316
VII Conclusion	321

## 10 · Academic epistemology

by MALCOLM SCHOFIELD, *Professor of Ancient Philosophy,  
University of Cambridge*

I Introduction	323
II Arcesilaus: the problem of interpretation	324
III Arcesilaus' position	327
IV Two objections to Arcesilaus	331
V Carneades on opinion and assent	334
VI Carneades on the impossibility of knowledge	338
VII Carneades' 'probabilism'	345
VIII Conclusion	350

## PART IV

## PHYSICS AND METAPHYSICS

## 11 · Hellenistic physics and metaphysics

by DAVID SEDLEY, *Professor of Ancient Philosophy, University of Cambridge*

I Introduction	355
II Diodorus Cronus	356
III Epicurean physics	362
IV Stoic physics and metaphysics	382

## 12 · Cosmology

by DAVID FURLEY, *Professor Emeritus of Classics, Princeton University*

I Introduction: the fourth-century legacy	412
II The Epicureans	418
III The early Stoics	432

## 13 · Theology

by JAAP MANSFELD

I Philosophical theology	452
--------------------------	-----

II Existence and attributes	454
III The gods, the world and men	462
IV Knowledge of God	469
v Academic views and criticisms	475
14 · Explanation and causation	
<i>by R. J. HANKINSON, Professor of Philosophy, University of Texas at Austin</i>	
I Background	479
II Stoic materialism	481
III The Stoic analysis of causation	483
IV Antecedent causes	487
v The concept of preceding causes	490
VI Dispositions and powers	491
VII Causes and conditions	494
VIII Causes and time	497
IX The Epicureans and causal explanation	498
x Teleology and mechanism	503
XI The limits of explanation: multiple explanations	505
XII The limits of explanation: empiricism	507
15 · Determinism and indeterminism	
<i>by R. J. HANKINSON</i>	
I The origins of the question	513
II Logic and contingency	516
III The Hellenistic response	517
IV The Epicurean position	522
v The Stoic response to the Master argument: fate and necessity	526
VI The Chrysippean notion of fate: soft determinism	529
VII Fate and responsibility: <i>confatalia</i> and the <i>eph' hēmin</i>	531
VIII Divination and fate	534
IX Soft determinism	537
x Fate and moral progress	540
16 · Epicurean psychology	
<i>by STEPHEN EVERSON, Professor of Philosophy, University of Michigan</i>	
I Introduction	542
II The <i>psuchē</i>	543
III Physicalism and materialism	546
IV Epicurean physicalism	550
v Voluntary action	553
VI Conclusion	558

## 17 · Stoic psychology

by A. A. LONG, *Irving Stone Professor of Literature in the Department of Classics, University of California at Berkeley*

- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| I Introduction  | 560 |
| II The physical structure of the <i>psuchē</i> and its location in the body | 562 |
| III Rationality and the faculties of the mind                               | 572 |
| IV Concluding remarks   | 584 |

## 18 · Philosophy, science and medicine

by GIUSEPPE CAMBIANO, *Professor of Ancient Philosophy at the University of Turin*

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| I Philosophy and mathematics                     | 585 |
| II Epicureanism and mathematics                  | 587 |
| III Scepticism and geometry                      | 590 |
| IV Philosophy, astronomy and astrology           | 595 |
| V Anatomy and philosophical questions            | 599 |
| VI Medical knowledge and experience              | 604 |
| VII Medical disputes and philosophical arguments | 608 |

## PART V

## ETHICS AND POLITICS

## 19 · The Socratic legacy

by A. A. LONG

- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| I Introduction                                      | 617 |
| II The Socratic presence in Greek ethics            | 618 |
| III Antisthenes and Diogenes – Cynic ethics         | 623 |
| IV Crates and the literary transmission of Cynicism | 629 |
| V Aristippus and Cyrenaic hedonism                  | 632 |
| VI Socratic ethics and Hellenistic scepticism       | 639 |

## 20 · Epicurean ethics

by MICHAEL ERLER, *Professor of Classics, University of Würzburg* and  
MALCOLM SCHOFIELD

- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| I Introduction                              | 642 |
| II Ethics within the philosophy of Epicurus | 644 |
| III Philosophical background                | 647 |
| IV Pleasure and the foundation of ethics    | 648 |
| V Pleasure as the goal                      | 651 |
| VI Desire and the limits of life            | 657 |

VII Virtue and friendship	666
VIII Practice	669
21 · Stoic ethics	
by BRAD INWOOD, <i>Professor of Classics, University of Toronto</i> , and PIERLUIGI DONINI, <i>Professor of the History of Philosophy at the State University of Milan</i>	
I Foundations and first principles	675
II <i>Oikeiōsis</i> and primary impulse	677
III Cosmic nature and human nature	682
IV The goal of life	684
V The good	687
VI Values, actions and choice	690
VII Passions	699
VIII Moral education and the problem of the passions	705
IX Virtue and wisdom	714
X Moral progress	724
XI Determinism and ethics: impulse with reservation	736
22 · Social and political thought	
by MALCOLM SCHOFIELD	
I Introduction	739
II An overview	740
III On kingship	742
IV Polybius on the growth and decline of constitutions	744
V Epicureanism on security	748
VI Zeno's <i>Republic</i>	756
VII Justice, <i>oikeiōsis</i> and the cosmic city	760
VIII Retrospect	769
Epilogue	771
MICHAEL FREDE	
<i>Synopsis of principal events</i> 798	
<i>Editions of sources and fragments</i> 805	
<i>List of abbreviations</i> 820	
<i>Bibliography</i> 828	
<i>Index locorum</i> 876	
<i>General index</i> 907	

## Sources

JAAP MANSFELD

### 1 Why so much has been lost

We know a good deal about Hellenistic<sup>1</sup> philosophy, but by no means as much as we would like to know. The reason is that with very few exceptions no works written by the Hellenistic philosophers themselves survive. The situation is therefore quite different from that in which we find ourselves with regard to the great classical philosophers, Plato and Aristotle. Plato's complete works have been preserved. Much of Aristotle's vast output has perished, but the philosophically more important part of his writings is still available. The reason for the preservation of these Platonic and Aristotelian corpora is that these works continued to be taught and studied in the philosophical schools. Treatises of Aristotle were taught by the late Neoplatonists as a preparation for the study of a set of dialogues by Plato, and those of his works which were not part of the curricula have mostly perished. The professional teachers of philosophy themselves were required to have perfect knowledge of practically everything these great masters had written.

But by the end of the third century AD the schools (in the sense both of institutions and schools of thought) which had been founded in the early Hellenistic period had died out.<sup>2</sup> The works of Epicurus and his immediate followers, or of the great early Stoics for example, were no longer taught, though a preliminary instruction in the views of the main schools could still be part of a decent pagan education in the fourth and to a much lesser extent in the fifth and sixth centuries AD.<sup>3</sup> The institutional basis

<sup>1</sup> For the nineteenth-century origin of this problematic denomination and periodization see Bichler 1983, Isnardi Parente 1985–6. For *belles-lettres* the classical period is the 5th century, for philosophy the 4th, for medicine the 5th/4th century BC. For mathematics it is the 3rd/2nd century BC, i.e. the early Hellenistic period (most of the works of Euclid, Archimedes and part of Apollonius having been preserved, as well as opuscula by other authors); for the traditions involved see Knorr 1989, esp. 224–45 on Pappus and Eutocius.

<sup>2</sup> On the philosophical recession in the third century AD see Longinus at Porph. *VP* 20, Saffrey and Westerink 1968, xli–xlii. <sup>3</sup> For the survival of doxographical literature see below, n. 65.

which would have ensured the preservation of the Hellenistic philosophers disappeared.

From the second to the fourth centuries AD the originally humble vellum (or papyrus) codex, the forerunner of our book, gradually replaced the papyrus scroll as the vehicle for higher forms of literature<sup>4</sup>. The works that were taught to students and studied by the professors themselves were carefully and systematically transcribed, and in sufficient numbers. The enormous mass of works that were no longer taught were either not transcribed at all and so eventually perished along with the fragile material on which they had been written, or transcribed in quantities that were not sufficiently large to warrant their survival, though works that were popular for other reasons had good chances to survive. Libraries tend to deteriorate and – much worse – burn.<sup>5</sup> In order to explain Plato and Aristotle, as the expression was, ‘from themselves’,<sup>6</sup> that is to say from what is stated in their own writings, there was no need to adduce the works of the Hellenistic philosophers. These thinkers and their later followers had often enough criticized Plato and Aristotle, or attempted to work out ideas which they believed to be better, and in some cases undoubtedly were better. But from the first centuries BC and AD onwards, the professors of Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy had taken some of these criticisms and alternatives into account in their oral or written comments and commentaries on individual works. Useful ideas worked out by philosophical rivals had been incorporated in updated versions of the Platonic system, and the ingenuity of Plato’s exegetes had found intimations of, and so a legitimation for, these ideas in Plato’s own works. The commentaries on the great classical philosophers were quite effective in protecting students against the impact of potentially destructive doctrines of rival schools. What the average student should know about Stoicism or Epicureanism, to mention only the more important currents, was found in elementary handbooks or in the Platonic and Aristotelian commentary literature itself. Doing philosophy had more and more turned into exegesis, that is to say into the study and interpretation of the works of the great classics.<sup>7</sup> The actual practice of teaching and doing phi-

<sup>4</sup> Up-to-date overviews in Cavallo 1989, 1994. For the disappearance of literary works that were no longer taught see Irigoin 1994, 72–6.

<sup>5</sup> For the history of transmission in general see Reynolds and Wilson 1978, Wilson 1983.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Schäublin 1977, and e.g. Procl. *TP* 1.2, p. 10.1–4.

<sup>7</sup> P. Hadot 1987, Sedley 1989a, 97–103, Barnes et al. 1991, 4–7, Baltes in Dörrie and Baltes 1993, 162–6, Erler 1993. For Demetrius of Laconia’s exegesis of Epicurus see Puglia 1988, and the comments of Roselli 1990, who compares Galen’s practice. For the commentaries on Aristotle see the papers in Sorabji 1990, with useful bibliography 484–524; for those on Plato Westerink 1990, lxi–lxxvi, Dörrie and Baltes 1993, 20–54, 162–226. For what should be taught and how see I. Hadot 1990, 1991, Mansfeld 1994b.

losophy therefore hardly encouraged the study of the original works written by representatives of other schools of thought. Accordingly, in the later exegetical literature concerned with Plato and Aristotle the doctrines of the Hellenistic philosophers that could not be assimilated survive, if at all, in a fossilized form, that is to say as objections or alternatives that were worth remembering precisely because they had been neutralized, and so provided useful material for training one's students.

## II Primary sources

The extant primary sources are very few. Epicureanism has fared comparatively well, because we still have three didactic letters written by Epicurus himself as well as a collection of aphorisms, the so-called *Key Doctrines* (*KD*), all preserved in Diogenes Laertius book x.<sup>8</sup> The letters are the *To Herodotus*, dealing with physics, the *To Pythocles*, dealing with cosmology and meteorology, and the *To Menoeceus*, dealing with ethics. It is important to recognize that these letters do not work at the same level. In the proems to the first two Epicurus makes a distinction between those who diligently study all his works and others who for one reason or other are not in a position to devote their life to the study of nature. For the latter the (lost) so-called greater *Greater Abstract* (from the multi-book treatise *On Nature*) had been especially written (*Ep. Hdt.* 35), whereas the *Ep. Hdt.* has been composed as an *aide-mémoire* for the accomplished Epicurean who no longer needs to go into the details (cf. *Ep. Hdt.* 83). At *Ep. Pyth.* 84–5 Epicurus says that a succinct account of cosmo-meteorology will be useful both for beginners and for those who are too busy to study the subject in depth. The *Ep. Pyth.* therefore is on the same level as the lost *Greater Abstract*, while the *Ep. Hdt.* is an entirely different sort of work. We are not in a position to read it with the eyes of its original public, because only (quite large) fragments of a number of books of the *On Nature* have been preserved among the remains of the library at Herculaneum.<sup>9</sup> The *Ep. Men.* is directed at young as well as at old readers, so presumably is a combination of introduction and *aide-mémoire*, though the protreptic element predominates. The *KD* is a sort of catechism.<sup>10</sup>

The remaining scraps of primary material are scanty indeed. Diogenes

<sup>8</sup> Another collection, the so-called *Gnomologium Vaticanum* (not to be confused with the other *Gnom. Vat.* edited by L. Sternbach 1963), first published by Wotke 1888, contains fragments of Epicurus (among which several sayings from the *KD*), and others, among whom Metrodorus. Further fragments, among which again several from the *KD*, are incorporated in the inscription of Diogenes of Oenoanda; text in M. F. Smith 1993. <sup>9</sup> See below, n. 20.

<sup>10</sup> For the role of such compendia in the Epicurean community see I. Hadot 1969a, 53–4, I. Hadot 1969b, see below, p. 670.

Laertius has preserved catalogues of the works of the more important Hellenistic philosophers,<sup>11</sup> but these are not always complete. For Epicurus, for instance, we are only given a selection, while the full and systematic bibliography of Chrysippus breaks off half way because the unique ancestor from which our extant manuscripts derive had already been damaged. For Stoicism we have the *Hymn to Zeus* by Cleanthes preserved in Stobaeus.<sup>12</sup> We also have the remains of part of Chrysippus' *Logical Investigations* (*PHerc.* 307)<sup>13</sup> and fragments of anonymous treatises, preserved in the library at Herculaneum. A large number of fragmentary scrolls containing the doctrines of minor Epicureans have also survived at Herculaneum. Further papyrus fragments have been found in Egypt.<sup>14</sup> Other first-hand evidence for the Hellenistic philosophers consists of verbatim quotations in a variety of authors, a number of whom only cite in order to refute. Pyrrho did not write anything, so for early Pyrrhonism we mainly have to rely on his disciple Timon, of whose works only fragments are extant. All our other evidence is at one or more removes from the originals and consists of various forms of reportage.

### III Secondary sources

For our information about Hellenistic philosophy we are therefore for the most part dependent on peripheral sources.<sup>15</sup> In this section, I shall briefly enumerate the more important among the works and authors that are involved. The earliest evidence is from about the mid-first century BC, and the fact that it is at our disposal at all is in two cases due to events which were rather unfortunate for those concerned.

In 46 BC the great rhetorician, orator and statesman Cicero, who had studied philosophy and read philosophical literature during his whole active life and already published works on political philosophy from a

<sup>11</sup> Similarly, Soranus is said to have composed a *Lives of Physicians and Schools and Writings*, ten books, *Suda* 1.4, 407.23–4. The more important catalogues are at D.L. vi.80 (Diogenes the Cynic), viii.4 (Zeno), vii.162 (Aristo), vii.166 (Herillus), vii.167 (Dionysius), vii.174–5 (Cleanthes), vii.170 (Sphaerus), vii.189–202 (Chrysippus), x.24 (Metrodorus), x.25 (Polyaenus), and x.27–8 (Epicurus).

<sup>12</sup> Nothing is known about its *Sitz im Leben*; I suspect that it may have served as an easily memorized compendium of Stoic thought. This would help to explain why it has been preserved. At any rate Cleanthes' four lines of prayer to Zeus-and-Destiny according to Epictetus will be always 'ready at hand' (*procheiron*), Epict. *Diss.* iii 22.95, iv 4.34; *Ench.* 53. For this technical term see I. Hadot 1969a, 58 n. 107. <sup>13</sup> Preliminary text at *FDS* 698.

<sup>14</sup> Eventually, this material will be better accessible in the *CPF* which for pieces whose author is known proceeds in alphabetical order.

<sup>15</sup> Glucker 1991 has carried out the interesting experiment of reconstructing in outline what would be our view of Plato if only the late derivative reports were still extant.

mostly Platonic and Stoic point of view, was forced to retire from the political scene. He had just written a short tract entitled *Stoic Paradoxes*, six rhetorical essays on philosophical issues. Because he wanted to continue to be of service to society, or at least to the ‘good people’, he decided to bring Greek philosophy to the Roman world by composing a series of philosophical treatises.<sup>16</sup> Some of these are dialogues in which issues in systematic philosophy are set out and discussed from the points of view of the major Hellenistic schools, namely by Epicurean, Stoic and Academic speakers. But in most of his other works too Cicero attempted to present the divergent options fairly fully, so that the reader would be in a position to make up his own mind. As a rule he does not take sides, though he indicates which point of view seems most plausible to him, or most useful – at least for the time being.

These works, the sequence of which by and large conforms to that of the parts of philosophy, but which fail to provide a complete treatment, were written in an unbelievably short span of time, from 45 to 43 BC. He started by writing a pamphlet, the *Hortensius* (lost), in which he warmly recommended the study of philosophy. Next came the *Academics*, of which two different editions were published. We still have the first part of the first book of the second edition, and the second book of the first; the former gives an overview of the three main divisions of philosophy, namely logic, physics, ethics, and the latter deals with epistemological questions from Stoic and sceptic angles. Next are the still extant five books of the *On the Chief Ends of Good and Evil*. In 44 BC, he first wrote the *Tusculan Disputations* in five books, consisting of disputes about questions of major practical importance between an anonymous and dominating master (Cicero himself) and an anonymous respondent. In the last book, for instance, the master argues that all the philosophers worth the name are agreed, or almost, that virtue is sufficient for happiness, but does so without committing himself on the nature of either happiness or virtue. Next is the *On the Nature of the Gods*, in three books, with one large and several small gaps in the third book which contains the Academic counter-arguments against the Stoic position. This work is not a theological treatise only, but also an important source for Stoic physics and cosmology

<sup>16</sup> Cicero describes the works he had written and still plans to write in the autobiographical at *Div.* II.1–4; cf. also the excursus at *ND* 1.6–7, and see P. L. Schmidt 1978, Steinmetz 1990. Rawson 1975, 230–48, Schofield 1986b, 48–51, and Powell 1995a, 7–11 are useful brief surveys. MacKendrick 1989 is a detailed study of the corpus, with summaries of each work and discussion of sources and influences; Görlner and Gawlick 1994 is an overview of the corpus (including the rhetorical treatises) and an up-to-date introduction to the philosophy. For *Tusc.* see also Douglas 1995.

because of the central role that the gods play in the Stoic conception of the cosmos.<sup>17</sup> The *On Divination* in two books follows; divination was an important issue in Stoic philosophy and a fact of Roman life. Book one argues pro, book two contra. The more technical *On Fate*, which treats a closely related topic, the arguments pro and contra determinism, survives only in mutilated form. Two rather literary essays, *On Old Age* and *On Friendship*, have also survived. Cicero further wrote the *Topics*,<sup>18</sup> a treatise on various forms of argument which is more rhetorical than logical. Finally he wrote the *On Duties* in three books, dedicated to his profligate son. This is a treatise, and a sternly moralistic one, in which he declines to furnish arguments against the rather dogmatic stance adopted. It should finally be added that the rhetorical treatises composed by Cicero in his youth and middle age are interesting sources for certain aspects of Hellenistic philosophy too, and of course also for the history of rhetoric.

Cicero was not the only person to promote philosophy in the Rome of his day. His younger contemporary Lucretius (died before 50 BC) wrote an epic poem in six books entitled *On the Nature of Things*,<sup>19</sup> which may have been published from his papers after his death. It deals with the whole of physics (including e.g. psychology and history of civilization) from the Epicurean point of view and is in fact an attempt to convert its readers to what we may call the gospel of Epicurus. It is one of the most important sources for Epicurean philosophy still extant.

We also have the carbonized remains of the philosophical library of a villa near Herculaneum, which was buried and thus preserved by an eruption of the Vesuvius in AD 79 and dug up in the eighteenth century.<sup>20</sup> The majority of these scrolls had been brought to the villa by a professional philosopher, the Epicurean Philodemus who was a contemporary of Cicero, or been produced there under his supervision or by his successors.<sup>21</sup> Needless to say, they have been very much damaged, firstly by nature, then not only by the patient human attempts to unwind and preserve them but also by stupidity and neglect. Apart from important

<sup>17</sup> See below, pp. 758–62.   <sup>18</sup> Not on a boat; see Immisch 1928.

<sup>19</sup> *De Rerum Natura* translates *Peri Phuseōs*, the title traditionally given to works by Presocratic philosophers such as that of Empedocles (much admired by Lucretius) or to treatises dealing with the philosophy of nature, like Epicurus' own *On Nature*. Note that Cic. *Acad.* 11.73 translates Metrodorus of Chius' title as *De natura*.

<sup>20</sup> Short overview of the contents with references to the literature in Dorandi 1995b; catalogues of the papyri: Gigante 1979, Capasso 1989.

<sup>21</sup> See Cavallo 1983, 58–65, 1984, 6–23, who further points out that the Epicurus scrolls have to be dated to the third–second centuries and will be copies of the holdings of the school at Athens; those with the works of Demetrius of Laconia date to the second–first centuries BC and are contemporary with the author.

remains of works by Epicurus and several other Epicureans (Carneiscus, Polyaeus, Polystratus, Demetrius of Laconia), the library comprises quite a number of writings composed by Philodemus himself.<sup>22</sup> It would seem that several of these are based on memoranda of lectures (*scholai*)<sup>23</sup> of Philodemus' masters. In some cases even parts of the drafts survive.<sup>24</sup> These books provide us with important insights into the discussions which took place both inside the Epicurean school and with opponents, e.g. the Stoics, and so are an important source of information for Hellenistic Stoicism too. Philodemus wrote among other things on signs, theology, ethical subjects, literary theory and rhetoric. Of particular relevance are the remains of his historical treatise, entitled *Arrangement of the Philosophers* (Σύνταξις τῶν φιλοσόφων), especially the two books dealing with the Academics and the Stoics. Of great interest too is his polemical treatise *On the Stoics*.<sup>25</sup>

Among the many works of the Jewish exegete of the Old Testament, Philo of Alexandria (died after AD 40), there are also several philosophical treatises which contain a considerable amount of information on Hellenistic philosophy. Two of these, *On the Eternity of the World* and *That Every Good Man is Free*, are extant in Greek; the other two, *On Providence*<sup>26</sup> and *Alexander or Whether Irrational Animals Possess Reason*, in a very literal sixth-century Armenian translation. Philo discussed topics which were of interest to an orthodox Jewish audience, and in some ways his position is comparable to that of Cicero *vis-à-vis* his Roman public. Like other Jews before and a whole crowd of Christian authors after him, he was convinced that the Greek philosophers had been either directly inspired by God or cribbed their doctrines from the Old Testament. Accordingly, their views could be used to interpret the Old Testament (as Philo did in his treatises devoted to the exegesis of the 'books of Moses') or to discuss issues which arose in the context of its interpretation.<sup>27</sup> For this reason, commentaries and homilies by learned Christians on individual books and passages of the Old as well as the New Testament may contain sections that are of interest for the historiography of philosophy, including Hellenistic philosophy, as long

<sup>22</sup> For modern editions see list of editions of sources and fragments, and bibliography. The villa also seems to have possessed a text of Lucretius, see Kleve 1989; but the fragments are minimal.

<sup>23</sup> The Epicurean Diogenes of Tarsus wrote a treatise entitled *Epilektai Scholai* or *Epilekta*, in at least twenty books; see D.L. x.97, 120, 136, 138. On *scholai* see Sedley 1989a, 103–4; cf. also Quint. *Inst.* i. 7. <sup>24</sup> Dorandi 1991d; cf. also Manetti 1994 on the *Anon. Lond.*

<sup>25</sup> See Dorandi 1990a and 1990b; texts: Dorandi 1982b, 1991b, 1994b.

<sup>26</sup> Several passages in Greek from *Prov.* II have been preserved by Eusebius.

<sup>27</sup> Mansfeld 1988a, Runia 1990, Runia 1993; in general Ridings 1995.

as one does not forget that these works have been composed from a particular point of view.

The date of the remains of a more general work, or works, by a certain Arius Didymus remains uncertain;<sup>28</sup> it may be as late as the third century AD. A systematic treatment of Stoic and of Peripatetic ethics which with some confidence may be attributed to him has been preserved in Stobaeus. Substantial fragments of his treatment of the physics of Aristotle (and his followers) and of the physical doctrines of the more important Stoics have been preserved by Eusebius and Stobaeus.<sup>29</sup> The title or titles of the work or works are not certain; fragments are quoted as from the *On Sects*, or *Abstract(s)*. One of the problems is that *epitomē* ('abstract') may pertain either to an abridgement of Didymus' work or to abstracts made from, or representing, the originals themselves.

Frequent references to Hellenistic philosophical doctrines are found in the voluminous writings of Plutarch (after 45–after 120). Of special importance are treatises such as the *On Moral Virtue*, and the polemical works against the Stoics and the Epicureans<sup>30</sup> which contain numerous verbatim quotations. The anti-Epicurean treatises are the *That Epicurus Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible*, the *Reply to Colotes* and the *Is 'Live Unknown' a Wise Precept?* The treatises directed against the Stoics are the *On Stoic Self-Contradictions*, the *Against the Stoics on Common Conceptions*, and an abstract of the *The Stoics Talk More Paradoxically than the Poets*. The even more voluminous extant works of Galen (c. 130–c. 210) are also peppered with references and verbatim quotations (but the special treatises which he devoted to Stoic and Epicurean philosophy are lost).<sup>31</sup> Of major importance is his great treatise *On the Doctrines of Plato and Hippocrates*, in which he argues against Chrysippus' philosophy of mind and ethics, and attempts to pin down his opponent by verbatim quotation on a fairly generous scale.<sup>32</sup> At *PHP* VIII.2.12–14, Galen describes his method by saying that he does not explain 'every expression, as writers of commentaries do',

<sup>28</sup> The identification of Arius Didymus with the Stoic Arius, court philosopher to the emperor Augustus, has been challenged by Heine 1869, 613–14 and Göransson 1995, 203–26.

<sup>29</sup> Moraux 1973, 259–443, Kahn 1983, Long 1983a, Hahn 1990; for the physical fragments Diels 1879, 69–87, 447–72, and Moraux 1973, 277–305 (on the Peripatetic section only). Göransson 1995, 206–7, 219–26, argues that the attribution to Didymus of the section on Stoic ethics is less certain than that of the section on the Peripatos, and that the provenance of the majority of the anonymous fragments in Stobaeus attributed to Arius Didymus by Diels is problematic. The latter argument is answered by Runia 1996a, cf. in general Mansfeld and Runia 1997, 238–64.

<sup>30</sup> Babut 1969, Hershbell 1992a, 1992b. A number of philosophical works by Plutarch have been lost; see list in Einarson and De Lacy 1967, 2.

<sup>31</sup> Titles at *Lib. Prop.* XIX 47–8.

<sup>32</sup> Vegetti 1986, Tieleman 1996; in general Hankinson 1992. Much remains to be done on Galen as a source for Greek philosophy.

but only 'those statements which give consistency to the doctrine'. A selective use of the commentary method by a person who did write a number of commentaries dealing with every expression, namely on Hippocratic works. Galen is also our major and in many cases only source for Hellenistic medicine,<sup>33</sup> and his essay *On Sects for Beginners* is still a most useful introduction to the doctrines of the principal medical schools. Another important source for Hellenistic medicine is the second part of the so-called *Anonymus Londinensis*,<sup>34</sup> to be dated to the second century AD, and information on the Dogmatists and Empiricists is also found in the proem of Celsus *De Medicina*, written in the early first century.<sup>35</sup>

Much information, though relatively little verbatim quotation (at least of Hellenistic philosophers, Timon excepted), is to be found in the works of the Neopyrrhonist philosopher-cum-physician Sextus Empiricus (probably second century AD). These are the treatise *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* in three books and the composite work *Adversus mathematicos*, consisting of a treatise (now) in six books *Against the Professors* (of grammar, mathematics etc., *M* I–VI) and of the remaining books of the original *Adversus mathematicos*, viz. two *Against the Logicians* (*M* VII–VIII), two *Against the Physicists* (*M* IX–X) and one *Against the Ethicists* (*M* XI).<sup>36</sup> From the titles of *M* VII–XI it is clear that Sextus' approach is not only polemical but also systematic. His aim is not to tell us what certain historical figures believed (and then to show the weaknesses of these beliefs), but rather to tell us what, in general, the Dogmatists believe and then to show the weaknesses of Dogmatism. Yet the Stoics are his most cherished opponents (*PH* I 65).

One of our most precious sources is the already-mentioned treatise in ten books of the otherwise unknown Diogenes Laertius (probably *c.* 230), entitled *Lives and Maxims of those who Have Distinguished themselves in Philosophy and the Doctrines of Each Sect*.<sup>37</sup> The Minor Socratics are treated in book II, the Academics up to Clitomachus in book VI, the Peripatetics up to

<sup>33</sup> Deichgräber 1930, W. D. Smith 1979, von Staden 1982, von Staden 1989, Lloyd 1991b, von Staden 1991. On the various connections of the Hellenistic schools with Hippocrates and Hippocratic medicine see Kudlien 1989.

<sup>34</sup> Text: Diels 1893; new edn in preparation, see Manetti 1986.

<sup>35</sup> Commentary by Mudry 1982; see also Deuse 1993.

<sup>36</sup> For the original form of *M* and the suggestion that the actual books VII–XI were originally VI–X see Blomqvist 1974, who hypothesizes that the original *M* I–V are lost. But the argument of Cortassa 1989 that the actual books III–IV originally were one and that the lost books of *M* are fewer is more plausible. On Sextus see Annas 1992b, Classen 1992, Decleva Caizzi 1992b, Döring 1992, Hülser 1992, Ioppolo 1992, Isnardi Parente 1992, Sedley 1992a. Note that in these papers Sextus' systematic presentations have been carved up according to prosopography and philosophical school, though Decleva Caizzi sketches a programme for the study of Sextus as an author. For a bibliography of the important writings on Sextus and related sceptic themes by K. Janáček see Barnes 1992, 4298–9.

<sup>37</sup> Martini 1899, 82–3, 86–7. For Soranus' similar title see above, n. 11.

Demetrius and Heraclides in book v, the Cynics up to Menedemus in book vi, the Stoics in book vii (which originally ended with Cornutus),<sup>38</sup> the Pyrrhonists in book ix, and Epicurus and the Epicureans in book x.<sup>39</sup> From the sequence of schools treated it is clear that Diogenes' approach is more historical in our sense of the word than for instance that of Sextus.

Other authors and books may be treated more briefly. A rather interesting little handbook of uncertain date is pseudo-Andronicus *On the Affections and the Virtues*,<sup>40</sup> which provides parallels for the treatment of Stoic ethics in Diogenes Laertius and Arius Didymus and for the mix of Stoic and Peripatetic ethics at Cic. *Inv.* II.159–78. The works of Seneca and Epictetus may be used, though with caution, for the understanding of early Stoic ethics. A rather orthodox line seems to be followed by the first century AD Stoic Hierocles.<sup>41</sup> In the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius (second century AD), a work written to amuse and instruct rather than for purposes of serious study, we nevertheless find useful information concerning Stoicism and Pyrrhonism.<sup>42</sup> Among the works of Alexander of Aphrodisias (died after AD 200) three treatises must be singled out because a Peripatetic alternative to Stoic doctrines is offered: the *On Mixture*, the *On Fate*, both extant in Greek, and the *On Providence* which survives in Arabic.<sup>43</sup> These should be used with some caution because it is not always certain that the Stoicism Alexander criticizes is Hellenistic. The learned Christian Clement of Alexandria (later part of the second century AD), whose attitude to Greek philosophy is indebted to that of Philo,<sup>44</sup> has worked important bits of information into the extant eight books of his *Strōmata* ('Patchworks');<sup>45</sup> book viii consists of abstracts,<sup>46</sup> most of which deal with philosophical themes. Other works by Clement are also relevant in this respect, as are those of the learned Origen (c. 185–c. 250).<sup>47</sup> The multi-book *Praeparatio Evangelica* of another not less learned Christian, Eusebius of Caesarea (c. 260–c. 340), who was sitting in a splendid library, is a huge anthology of verbatim excerpts from a plurality of authors, with comments and connecting passages by Eusebius himself. In this way, passages from among others Arius Didymus, Diogenianus,

<sup>38</sup> Mansfeld 1986, 358–60, Dorandi 1992a.

<sup>39</sup> Minor Socratics: Giannantoni 1986b, Knoepfler 1991; Academics: Long 1986a, Dorandi 1992b; Peripatetics: Moraux 1986, Sollenberger 1992; Cynics: Goulet-Cazé 1992; Stoics: Mansfeld 1986; Pyrrhonists: Barnes 1992; Epicurus: Mansfeld 1986, 373–9. On Diog. Laert. in general see Schwartz 1905, Mejer 1978, Mejer 1992. The manuscript tradition has been sorted out by Knoepfler 1991, but see Dorandi 1995c for additional information.

<sup>40</sup> Text in Glibert-Thirry 1977; both longer and shorter versions were in circulation.

<sup>41</sup> The text of the papyrus has been newly edited with commentary by Bastianini and Long 1992.

<sup>42</sup> Goulet 1989.

<sup>43</sup> On Alexander see Sharples 1987; texts in Todd 1976, Sharples 1983, Ruland 1976.

<sup>44</sup> Lilla 1970, Runia 1993, 132–56. Cf. also Spanneut 1957, Le Boulluec 1994.

<sup>45</sup> Méhat 1966. <sup>46</sup> Nautin 1976. <sup>47</sup> Dorival 1992.

Numenius and Aristocles have been preserved which are important for the history of Hellenistic Stoicism, Pyrrhonism, and Academic scepticism. The first two books of the huge and invaluable anthology of Ioannes Stobaeus (fifth century), which survives only in mutilated form, are called *Eclogae physicae et ethicae* ('Selections Dealing with Physics and Ethics'). This systematically structured work has preserved much of Arius Didymus and Aëtius, but in the *Eclogae* as well as in the following books, the so-called *Florilegium*, other precious texts too have been preserved; we may recall, for instance, Cleanthes' *Hymn* (*Ecl.* 1.1.12).

One of the factors involved in the survival of these secondary sources is the popularity of an author as a literary model and/or his usefulness for Christian writers. Cicero and Plutarch, who were more famous for their non-philosophical works, were much admired, and Cicero's philosophical works proved useful to the Latin Fathers of the West.<sup>48</sup> Philo survived because he was used and admired by some of the learned Christians of the East.<sup>49</sup> Yet a good number of Plutarch's so-called *moralia*, as well as some of Cicero's *philosophica*, have been lost, and there are gaps in the corpus of Philo's writings too.

#### IV *Quellenforschung*

Understandably, scholars would like to go back from these secondary sources to (the) original works, or at least to intermediary secondary sources closer in time to these originals and so, supposedly, truer to them. Because from a historical point of view the information provided by the original work of a philosopher is to be preferred to a later rendering, rehash, or reinterpretation, however competent or philosophically interesting, much work has been done to ferret out the lost original sources of the derivative sources for Hellenistic philosophy which we still have. We may for example ask ourselves whether Lucretius versified extant and/or lost works by Epicurus, or also used works by younger Epicureans. This is important for our view of Epicurus as well as of Lucretius. The rediscovery of Theophrastus' previously lost *Metarsiology*, one of the works used in Epic. *Ep. Pyth.*, has shown that certain passages in Lucretius may derive from the *Greater Epitomē*.<sup>50</sup> It is also worth our while to try to find out to what extent Seneca may have used particular works of Chrysippus

<sup>48</sup> For Cicero see Hagendahl 1958, 399-401, 1967, 52-168, 486-553, Ogilvie 1978, 59-72, MacKendrick 1989, 258-60; for Lucretius Hagendahl 1958, 9-88, Ogilvie 1978, 15-16; for Seneca Lausberg 1970, 14-35, Hagendahl 1967, 676-9, Trillitzsch 1971, Vol. I 120-85, Vol. II 362-83, Ogilvie 1978, 72. <sup>49</sup> Runia 1993, 16-30.

<sup>50</sup> Mansfeld 1992b (J. Schmidt 1990, 34-7 is out of date).

directly.<sup>51</sup> This kind of inquiry has been traditionally called *Quellenforschung* (or *Quellenanalyse*, *Quellenkritik*), derived from the German word for source, *Quelle*. This enjoys a bad reputation today, especially among students of ancient philosophy,<sup>52</sup> though our scholarship is still much dependent on the results of the largely forgotten investigations carried out in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.<sup>53</sup> But one instance which does not know itself is as much *à la mode* as ever, the quest for the historical Socrates. Yet the only Socrates available is a *plurale tantum*, namely Plato's + Xenophon's + Aeschines' etc., etc., to be augmented with a crowd of Socrateses according to the various receptions in the Hellenistic and later schools. In biblical scholarship the method is as alive as ever, for example in the study of the synoptic Gospels and the Pentateuch. As a matter of fact, *Quellenforschung* is a relative of another genealogical method which today is still considered to be indispensable, namely stemmatology, or the establishing of a family tree for a plurality of extant manuscripts containing a text, or a corpus of texts, though we have become aware of the phenomenon of so-called open transmission.<sup>54</sup> An often used method (deriving from New Testament studies) is that of the printing of similar texts in parallel columns.<sup>55</sup>

We may distinguish between two main models, or forms, of *Quellenforschung*. The first is the tracing back of a single extant work, for instance the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey*, to a plurality of sources; the hypothesis that these epics have been combined from a number of independent shorter poems, to which other material was added later, was already formulated in the seventeenth century. The second is the tracing back of a plurality of extant texts, or parts thereof, to a hypothetical single source. Just as all lagers are the offspring of *Pilsener Urquell*, so a plurality of manuscripts may derive from a single lost ancestor, the so-called archetype.<sup>56</sup> An exceedingly influential instance of this second type of *Quellenforschung* is the reconstruction of the lost source commonly called Aëtius, which

<sup>51</sup> Fillion-Lahille 1984, 51–118.

<sup>52</sup> In other areas of classics it can still, or again, be practised quite successfully; see e.g. Brunt 1980 (ancient historians), Cameron 1993 (Greek anthology).

<sup>53</sup> For precedents and parallels in Old Testament studies see Ackroyd 1970, Kraus 1982, Smend 1984, for New Testament studies Evans 1970, 265–77, Kümmel 1970, Mansfeld and Runia 1997, 95–7.

<sup>54</sup> Diels 1879, 40 combines the direct, indirect and MSS traditions of ps.Plutarch in a single stemma. Cf. also Bernheim 1908, 396, 400, 403 (on texts), and 420 (on MSS). See further Mansfeld 1998. <sup>55</sup> Mansfeld and Runia 1997, 88–94, 116–20.

<sup>56</sup> Mansfeld and Runia 1997, 88, 91. A comparable application of this geneticist paradigm is the construction of the family tree of Indo-European languages and the hypothesis of a common lost mother tongue (and lost intermediary ancestors of e.g. the group of Germanic, or Celtic, languages). This began with Schlegel 1808 and esp. Bopp 1816; see e.g. Timpanaro 1972.

according to Diels' analysis is the ancestor, or source of, the extant *Placita* of pseudo-Plutarch and of the parallel sections in Stobaeus and Theodoret.<sup>57</sup>

These two forms may be combined in several ways. A plurality of sources may for instance be posited for (parts of) a particular book of Philodemus, or Cicero, or Lucretius, or Philo, or Sextus, or Diogenes Laertius, and sections in these authors which are very much similar may then be traced back to single sources that have been lost.<sup>58</sup> This procedure may be of help in understanding passages which remain in part obscure when studied in isolation, and also in eliminating errors. Furthermore, noticing correspondences brings out the differences much more clearly, and so helps to determine the stance of an individual author. It goes without saying, however, that pinpointing a source, or shared tradition, is not equivalent to interpreting a thought. Source-criticism should be no more than an unavoidable means to an end, that is, the understanding of ideas in philosophy.

We should moreover not overlook that (to mention only one instance) an author such as Cicero, though not a professional philosopher, really knew a lot of philosophy by heart, as it were.<sup>59</sup> He has one of his speakers (Cotta) address his opponent as follows:

I have memorized all your arguments, and in the right order. (*ND* III. 10)

<sup>57</sup> Diels 1879, Runia 1989, Mansfeld 1990a, 1992c, Laks 1996; Diels' reconstruction revised in Mansfeld and Runia 1997. On the *Plac.* see below; the Arabic translation of pseudo-Plutarch (not of Aëtius!) has been edited and translated by Daiber 1980; the Greek text has been newly edited by Mau 1971, and edited and translated with some comments by Lachenaud 1993. The variety of *Quellenforschung* practised by e.g. Corsen 1878, a pupil of Usener just like Diels, has been far less successful because it does not much more than substitute one name, e.g. Posidonius, for another, e.g. Cicero, or (when a plurality of sources is postulated) is based on the assumption of contradictions in the text. This is pseudo-precision, and highly subjective. But exceptions exist; cf. below, n. 59 *ad fin.*

<sup>58</sup> For instance the Epicurean doxographies in Phld. *Piet.* (*PHerc.* 1428) and Cic. *ND* 1 (below, text to n. 80), and sections in Cic. *ND* III and S.E. *M* IX dealing with the gods (see below, p. 475), have so much in common that a shared source is plausible. Baltes, in Dörrie and Baltes 1993, 165–6, points out that interpretations of individual Plato passages in Cicero, Philo, Seneca and Plutarch can only be explained against the backdrop of a commentary tradition.

<sup>59</sup> So rightly Boyancé 1936, but note that his argument against *Quellenforschung* (cf. above, n. 57) is based on Cicero and literature related to Cicero alone, and that he has its history begin with Madvig's edn. of *Fin.* of 1839 (Madvig, followed by others, took *Ad Att.* XII.52.3 too literally, where Cicero seems to say that his works are mere 'transcripts', *apographa*; the text moreover is corrupt). Yet Boyancé accepts that in certain privileged cases source-critical comparison is useful, a point often missed by his followers, e.g. Lévy 1996. On the correct and incorrect uses of *Quellenanalyse* Bernheim (1908) 358–503, 529–70 is still very much worth reading; see esp. 404–13 on how to reconstruct lost sources ('Nachweis verlorener Quellen'), with references to predecessors of Boyancé dealing with the sources of Livy, or the traditions of Carolingian literature. See now the judicious remarks on the main source (Panaetius' Περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος) in relation to *Off.*, and on Cicero's own contributions, in Dyck 1996, 18–21, and his commentary, *passim*.

The practice of memorizing the main points of a speech in the right order was taught in the rhetorical schools, which makes Cotta's statement dramatically credible. Cicero writes to his friend Atticus for books and has his own libraries. Nevertheless, in some cases his sources were things he knew and remembered, or believed he knew and remembered, rather than things he had just looked up or was directly translating, or paraphrasing, from a book in front of him, though he often did translate or check. But his attitude towards his sources was quite free; speaking of his treatment of Stoic ethics, he points out:

I shall follow them [. . .] not as a translator but shall, as I am wont to do, draw from these sources what seems right, using my own judgement and making my own decisions. (*Fin.* III.7)

So *Quellenforschung*, even when done properly, may remain somewhat inexact.

#### v Genres

History of philosophy not as philosophy but as history, or as the ideal of an impartial and exact rendering of what earlier philosophers said rather than an interpretation, evaluation or even critique of what they said, implied or meant, is not an ancient genre. In fact, the methodological principle involved was first clearly formulated and applied in the nineteenth century. In antiquity history of philosophy was part of philosophy, just as, at least in certain cases, the history of medicine was part of medical science. The previous history of philosophy and medicine was seen as important from a systematic and scientific rather than a purely historical point of view. This is in agreement with the growing 'classicist' tendency, beginning in the first century BC, to appeal to famous figures from the distant past – this not being 'past', *passé*, *vergangen*. Such a systematic approach to one's philosophical predecessors is already found in Plato, and on a much larger and far more influential scale in Aristotle. Originality or novelty (*kainotomia*) was a dirty word; the various philosophical schools tended to consider themselves (or were considered by others) to belong with the general tradition of Greek philosophy and to depend on past masters.

We should therefore look a bit more closely at the various ancient genres which, in a loose sense of the word, we may call historiographic, or which contain material that is important for the history of philosophy: (i) doxography, (ii) biography, (iii) literature on sects (*Peri Haireseōn*), (iv) literature on the successions of the philosophers in their respective schools

(*Diadochai*), (v) collections of maxims (*gnōmai*), apophthegms, anecdotes, pronouncement stories (*chreiai*), and brief abstracts,<sup>60</sup> and (vi) introductions (*Eisagōgai*). It should however be borne in mind that these genres are not rigidly distinct.<sup>61</sup>

## VI Doxography

The widely used and frequently misused modern term doxography was coined by Diels for a genre he reconstructed and which he believed to be reliable because he regarded Theophrastus' lost *Physical Tenets* (*Physikai doxai*) as the ultimate ancestor of the tradition.<sup>62</sup> This genre was, in his view, to be sharply distinguished from fanciful biography. There is some truth to this distinction,<sup>63</sup> but as we shall see it does not hold generally. Unavoidably Diels also had to allow for a mixed bio-doxographic genre. Doxography according to him is the systematic description of the tenets (*placita*, *doxai*, *areskonta*), or doctrines, of the philosophers.

But Diels is responsible for a confusion. The genre he derives from Theophrastus, which deals with collections of briefly formulated tenets from a systematic point of view, should not right away be put on a par with the often extensive description of the doctrines of a single philosopher, or school, such as we find in the individual books of Diogenes Laertius' treatise, or in Cicero. Oddly enough, Diels neglected to inquire for what purposes these collections of contrasting *doxai* had been assembled.<sup>64</sup> From the extant *Placita* of pseudo-Plutarch (restricted to tenets in the fields of natural philosophy) and related large and smaller excerpts in other authors which he very successfully traced back to a single lost work,<sup>65</sup> it is already quite clear that such tracts are concerned with

<sup>60</sup> The distinction between a *gnōmē* and an apophthegm/anecdote is that the latter links the maxim to a specific person; the *chreia* often develops this further into a little story (Nassen Poulos 1981). Useful survey of Greek collections of *gnōmai* in Küchler 1979, 236–61; for the problems involved in the reconstruction of the gnomic traditions, for which the material surviving in Arabic appears to be indispensable, see Gutas 1975. Full and exemplary treatment at Berger 1984, 1049–74, 1092–110. In anthologies material could survive anonymously; see e.g. the cento of fragments of Epicurus at Porph. *Marc.* 27–32 which presumably derives from a florilegium.

<sup>61</sup> In general see Berger 1984, 1036–48, and for the genres mentioned in the text Mansfeld 1986, 303–10.

<sup>62</sup> Diels followed his *Doktorvater* Usener, oblivious of the fact that Theophrastus too had a sort of *Doktorvater*, viz. Aristotle. For the correct title of Theophrastus' treatise (called *Physikōn Doxai* by Usener and Diels) see Mansfeld 1990a, 1992c, and for Diels' method Mansfeld and Runia 1997, 64–110.

<sup>63</sup> D.L. III.47 distinguishes the *bios* 'life', from the *doxai* 'doctrines', of Plato, and VII.38 the *bios* of Zeno from the *dogmata* of the Stoics. <sup>64</sup> Mansfeld 1990a, 1992c.

<sup>65</sup> See above, pp. 14–15. We may note in passing that the *epitomē* of ps.Plutarch is extant, while Aëtius and his predecessors are lost; clearly, shorter works have a better chance to survive.

*problems* and the alternative solutions to these problems provided by the philosophers of nature, and in some cases doctors and astronomers. In the *Placita* literature the tenets are more important than the names of those said to have held them. Names often occur in systematic rather than chronological order, the system of arrangement being that of the tenets, and name-labels may be attached in a cavalier way. It may happen that tenets which we can check because the original ultimate sources (e.g. Plato, Aristotle) survive have been compressed and modified almost beyond recognition. Caution is therefore an absolute must whenever no such check is possible. The problems themselves (coinciding with chapters or parts of chapters) are arranged according to a systematic pattern based on standard topics and check-lists of questions relating to these topics. For instance on the gods the following questions are asked: do they exist? what are they, i.e. what do they consist of? how are they, i.e. what are their attributes (e.g. what is their shape)? where are they?, etc.<sup>66</sup>

I see no objection to calling Aëtius a doxographer and would provisionally define a doxographer of the Aëtian type as someone who provides materials for discussion both for the purpose of training and as a starting-point for further research. The author of an earlier collection which according to Diels is Aëtius' source and which was used by e.g. Varro and Cicero however, seems to have had an axe to grind and been a person of sceptic leanings, desirous of producing deadlocks through the disagreement of the tenets (*diaphōnia*). Such a diaphonic structure is still clearly recognizable in Aëtius. I believe that this earlier work, or rather (one of) its predecessor(s), was already used by Chrysippus.<sup>67</sup>

This brings us to doxography at one remove, namely the exploitation of doxographic materials relating to a definite issue in physics, psychology, theology and metaphysics. In fact, collections of the Aëtius type were widely utilized. They offered a frame of reference and enabled philosophers or scientists to provide an overview of and arguments against those views they wanted to discuss. Various motives could be involved: rejection, appropriation, revision, supplementation or complete replacement. Ethical doxographies were compiled for the same end. To give one example, Plutarch, before arguing in favour of his own view concerning moral virtue, writes:<sup>68</sup>

<sup>66</sup> Aët. 1.7, II.4. 15–17. These types of questions derive from Aristotle; see Mansfeld 1992c, 70–109, also for their impact on the treatment of philosophical issues in the later literature.

<sup>67</sup> Mansfeld 1989c.

<sup>68</sup> The doxography follows. The extensive doxography concerned with the *telos* at Clem. *Strom.* II.127.1–133.7 is structurally different from the brief one at Cic. *Fin.* II.34–5 and the fuller one at *Fin.* v.16–23; for those in Cicero see Algra 1997.

It is better to give a brief overview of the (tenets) of the others, not so much for the sake of the record as that my own view may become clearer and more firmly established when these others have been presented first. (*Virt. Mor.* 440e)

Readers were obviously familiar with this technique. Aristotle is the important pioneer; he used his own collections of *doxai* which most of the time he used as a prelude to working out an original solution, in physics as well as in ethics. Epic. *Ep. Pyth.* applied the method in a way which is different from Aristotle's, because for certain problems in cosmo-meteorology he allowed for sets of equally feasible solutions, rejecting only those which flatly contradicted the phenomena.<sup>69</sup> Wilamowitz, referring to Woltjer's book on Lucretius, once suggested that apart from the Peripatetic doxographic tradition one should also allow for and try to reconstruct an Epicurean tradition. I believe that this split is unnecessary and that the differences can be explained in terms of the specific use made of the available material.<sup>70</sup>

The *Placita* of pseudo-Plutarch and its relatives and predecessors were used by numerous authors, from at least Chrysippus to Philoponus. But the sections in their works based on or inspired by doxographic overviews of the Aëtius type should as a rule *not* be called doxographic. This also holds for comparable sections in Sextus (and presumably Aenesidemus), who needed doxographic collections of opposed views to produce suspension of judgement. The same goes for Philo, who selects tenets according to agreement or disagreement with Scripture, and also for a number of Christian authors, who may argue that all the pagans were wrong, or that some among them were right to some extent. The use of a doxography as a first orientation may encourage an author to look up an original text, and to quote or paraphrase a passage or a few pages. To give an example, Cicero when writing *Tusc.* checked Dicaearchus' own formulation of his view on the existence and location of the soul and its regent part (*Tusc.* 1.21).

## VII On sects

The other historiographic genres dealing with the philosophies of the past are more difficult to determine because clear examples are no longer extant, or at least not completely extant.<sup>71</sup> The treatise of Diogenes

<sup>69</sup> See below, pp. 288–9, 505–7.

<sup>70</sup> Von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1881, 2 n. 1, Woltjer 1877; Mansfeld 1994a.

<sup>71</sup> Useful overview of genres, authors and titles at Mejer 1978, 60–95.

Laertius seems to be a combination of a variety of genres: biography, doxography (though not according to the Aëtian pattern), literature dealing with successions and with the sects, and collections of maxims and anecdotes which are not a historiographic genre in the proper sense of the word.<sup>72</sup> This odd medley of the insipid and the invaluable has often puzzled scholars, but here the young Cicero provides us with the key.<sup>73</sup> At *Inv.* II.116–48, he deals with the interpretation of written documents such as wills and laws, which often allow of more than one interpretation. We are told how to tackle this problem; the most important piece of advice runs as follows:<sup>74</sup>

One ought to estimate what the writer meant *from the rest of his writings and from his acts, words, character and life*, and to examine the whole document which contains the ambiguity in question in all its parts, to see if any thing agrees with our interpretation or is opposed to the sense in which our opponent interprets it. (*Inv.* II.117)

The backdrop of Cicero's advice is much wider and pertains to the study of written documents in general, especially in the fields of literature and philosophy. The study of the life, activities and sayings of a philosopher was regarded as an indispensable preliminary to that of his writings. In those cases where no books were available the 'life' itself, including acts and apophthegms etc. and in some cases private documents, had to suffice. Conversely, if biographical data were unavailable they were made up from what a person wrote, or from what others were supposed to have written about him. Practices such as these gave ancient biography, or at least part of it, its bad name.<sup>75</sup> But I am not now concerned with the reliability of the protean genre from a historical point of view but with its historic function. Life and work, or teaching, have to be in agreement; in some cases the works may have been used to (re)construct the relevant aspects of the 'life', but the biography itself, be it detailed or compressed, was certainly believed to be needed to understand the works and doctrines.<sup>76</sup>

<sup>72</sup> On these as important ingredients in the biographies of philosophers see Gallo 1980, 13, Nassen Poulos 1981; in general Arrighetti 1994. For the fictitious aspect of certain types of *chreia* see Glucker 1988. Cf. also above, n. 60. Interesting hypothesis concerning Diogenes' method of composition in Goulet 1997.

<sup>73</sup> Mansfeld 1994b, 177–82.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Cic. *Part. Or.* 132, which is less clear. A more conventional treatment at e.g. [Cic.] *Rhet. Her.* 1.19–20, II.14, Cic. *De Or.* 1.139–40, Quint. *Inst.* VII.5.5–6; cf. Leeman and Pinkster 1981, 237–8.

<sup>75</sup> Leo 1901, 104–8, Dihle 1970, 104–7, Arrighetti 1987, 141–8, 164–7, Momigliano 1993, 70. Canfora 1993 is a fine pastiche of a dubious ancient biography.

<sup>76</sup> See further Arrighetti 1994, Mansfeld 1994b, 177–91.

The literature *On Sects*, a Hellenistic genre, dealt with the doctrines of the important philosophical and medical schools. Lost works with this title are attributed to various people by Diogenes Laertius, and have been used by him at one or more removes. The first to write a book on the philosophical sects seems to have been Hippobotus.<sup>77</sup> Important philosophers, e.g. the Stoic Panaetius (D.L. 11.87) and the Academic sceptic Clitomachus (D.L. 11.92) wrote works with this title. Galen's extant *On Sects for Beginners* belongs with this genre, but also with another, the *Eisagōgai* or *Introductions* literature. The remains of Arius Didymus' work(s) presumably belong here as well, and we may perhaps believe that it/they compared the doctrines of the main schools in the domains of logic, ethics and physics respectively.<sup>78</sup> A brief abstract (not ethical but epistemological) is cited at Stob. 11.1.17 as 'Of Didymus: from the *On Sects*' (Διδύμου ἐκ τοῦ Περὶ αἰρέσεων). One aim of this type of literature seems to be to offer reasonably objective information on the divergent views. But it could also serve to set off the doctrines more sharply against each other by way of a sort of blow-up of a chapter, or a set of chapters, in Aëtius. Another aim could be to defend the views of a particular school against those of the others. The word *hairesis* (usually translated 'school' or 'sect') means 'choice' or 'option', then also 'what is chosen'.<sup>79</sup> A choice for something as a rule also is a choice against something else, but a more or less impartial overview of the options that are open is also an option.

A number of Cicero's philosophical works are composed according to this contrasting pattern too. In *ND*, for instance, the different views of the Epicureans and the Stoics on the gods are treated in the first part of *ND* I and in II respectively, and the Academic speaker argues against in the second part of I and in III. *ND* I moreover includes at its beginning a doxography, or a survey of the contrasting tenets of the philosophers starting with Thales about the gods from an Epicurean point of view (*ND*

<sup>77</sup> Remains of Hippobotus in Gigante 1983c. On medical works entitled *Against the Sects*, *On the Empiricist Sect*, and *On the Sect of Herophilus* see von Staden 1982, 77–80. Porph. *In Ptol. Harm.* 3.1–12 says that there are numerous *haireseis* of musical theorists, the most prominent being the Pythagorean and the Aristoxenean; 5.11–13 cf. 25.4–6 he cites the *On the Difference of the Pythagorean Musical Theory from the Aristoxenean* by Didymus 'the musician', on whom see Barker 1989, 230.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. above n. 28 and text thereto. The main mistake of Giusta 1964–7, which contains much useful material, is that he believes in the existence of a lost ethical doxography parallel to the physical doxography of Aëtius.

<sup>79</sup> How 'choice' could come to mean 'school of thought' – for which see Glucker 1978, 166–93 – and then 'school' *tout court* is illustrated e.g. at Alb. *Intr.* 150.15 H., where the person who has decided to become a Platonist is indicated as τὸ Πλατωνὸς αἰρουμένος 'one who takes Plato's side' (see LSJ s.v. αἰρέω B.2); cf. also Cic. *ND* 1.85.

I.18–43),<sup>80</sup> ostensibly intended to shore up the argument that the *doxa* of Epicurus is the only correct one, but simultaneously providing a thoroughly doxographic introduction to the subject of the treatise. Accordingly, *ND* is not a representative of a ‘pure’ genre. The questions concerned with ‘existence’, ‘what-it-is’, ‘how-it-is’ which to a large extent determine the structure of the discussion in this work are familiar from the doxographies of the Aëtius type as well. The Greek term for such a general issue is *thesis*, the Latin *quaestio infinita*, i.e. an issue, or problem, which is not restricted to individuals or particulars. When you have such a *quaestio*, the views about its solution will inevitably differ.<sup>81</sup>

Though some among Cicero’s treatises in the field of ethics, i.e. *Tusc.* and especially *Off.*, are more one-sided, the major work *Fin.* is devoted to the exposition and critical comparison of the various views. The overviews of the doctrines of the schools in D.L. 11–x, I believe, are also indebted to the literature *On Sects*, for traces of comparison (*sunkrisis*) are still visible.<sup>82</sup> Though the sceptically inclined Cicero and the more irenic Diogenes Laertius want to inform their public rather than to take sides in the dispute, preferences may be expressed (Cicero is very critical of Epicureanism and not always fair,<sup>83</sup> Diogenes favours it). Yet it is important to acknowledge that the works *On Sects* are written from the point of view that the doctrines are significantly divergent, that the views of the schools are in many ways opposed to each other, and that – as Cicero approvingly says – this makes philosophy a really worthwhile and ongoing affair:

In Greece itself philosophy would never have been held in such high honour, if it had not derived its vitality from the disputes and disagreements among its greatest practitioners. (*Tusc.* 11.4)<sup>84</sup>

Again and again, Cicero highlights the disagreements of the philosophers, both from one school to another or within one and the same

<sup>80</sup> Largely paralleled in Phld. *Piet.* (*PHerc.* 1428); see Diels 1879, 531–50, Henrichs 1974, and above, n. 58. Obbink (1996) argues that Philodemus is Cicero’s immediate source, but this cannot be proved, and *Piet.* may even have been written later than the *ND*.

<sup>81</sup> Mansfeld 1990a, 3193–208, or 1992c, 70–93. On the *thesis* see Throm 1932.

<sup>82</sup> E.g. D.L. 11.86–90 (with reference to Panaetius, *On Sects*) and x.136–8, critical comparison of the Epicureans and the Cyrenaics; vii.121 versus x.119, on the question whether the philosopher should behave as a Cynic; vii.127, contrast between Stoics and Peripatetics which recalls the argument of Cic. *Fin.* 111–v.

<sup>83</sup> He sometimes exploits the vulgar misunderstanding of the ethics and fails to take notice of developments in the school; see Erler 1992b. But his treatment of Epicurus in *Tusc.* v.26, 31, 73–5, 88–9 is quite fair.

<sup>84</sup> This point is applied to different views among the Christians by Orig. *Cels.* 111.12 (who adduces the philosophical as well as the medical sects); cf. further Greg. Thaum. *Or. Pan.* xiv.170–2 (text in Crouzel 1969). The biblical proof-text is *Gal.* 5:20.